



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/842,082	04/26/2001	Jae Kyung Lee	P-222	6941
34610	7590	06/02/2006	EXAMINER	
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP			RAMAN, USHA	
P.O. BOX 221200				
CHANTILLY, VA 20153			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2623	

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/842,082	LEE ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Usha Raman	2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 February 2006.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on February 27th, 2006 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 10, and 27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3-15, and 18-21, 31-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayward et al. (US Pat. 6,629,134).

In regards to claims 1, and 10, Hayward discloses a system for providing the user of a computer peripheral function information (guided tour, interactive demonstration of peripheral operation) and error check up menu (upon occurrences of error conditions) of the product by using a proper information (peripheral indicia)

and contact information (i.e. product website site) of the product. The system comprises means to automatically detect the product indicia in case of an error and establish communications with a support site, and therefore inherently stores the proper information and the contact information in order to establish communication with the product site. See abstract, column 5, lines 10-19, and lines 53-57. The controlling unit is the computer 30, that displays information corresponding to the function information (see column 5, lines 55-57) and an error check up menu of the product received from the Internet (see column 6, lines 25-48, and column 7, lines 51-61) based on the proper information of the product and the contact information.

Hayward only discloses that the product comprises a computer peripheral and does not disclose a television in communication with the computer system.

Examiner takes official notice that TV card was a well known computer peripheral device at the time of the invention, that can be added to a computer, thereby allowing the computer to act like a television by providing broadcast programs.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by adding a TV card peripheral device to the computer of Hayward, thereby enabling TV functionalities at the computer. The modified computer/TV comprises the capabilities of displaying information corresponding to function information and error check up menu of the peripheral device (TV) from the Internet based on the proper information of the TV and the contact information.

In further regards to claim 10, the step of “selecting information from the received service menu information” is anticipated by user selecting on of plurality of options available regarding the product information as well as diagnostics. See Hayward: column 6, lines 20-24, and column 7 lines 48-51.

In regards to claim 3, Hayward discloses launching a communications browser to connect with a server site for product support to a particular peripheral condition (i.e. a specific query or error condition). See abstract, column 6, lines 26-47.

In regards to claim 4, Hayward discloses that in response to establishing communications with product site, additional information for helping the user through the peripheral condition is sent from the server. See column 6, lines 47-57.

In regards to 5, Hayward discloses transmitting “proper” information (peripheral indicia) identifying the product to the server. See column 3, lines 65-67 and column 4, lines 1-11.

In regards to claim 6, Hayward discloses establishing a connection to service site over the Internet using a network interface device such as a modem. See column 3, lines 4-11.

In regards to claim 7, Hayward discloses that the proper information (peripheral indicial) is a model name or model number of the product. See abstract and column 3, lines 65-67 and column 4, lines 1-2.

In regards to claim 8, Hayward discloses that the contact information is a URL to the manufacturer’s site. See column 6, lines 31-41.

In regards to claims 9 and 19, Hayward discloses that the product support information includes guided tour and demonstration of the peripheral operation. Therefore when the peripheral coupled on the home network comprise a television, the guided tour and demonstration of the peripheral operation would pertain to information corresponding to audio/video related function of the television.

In regards to claims 11 and 35, Hayward discloses diagnosing an error, and receiving measures (i.e. the received selected information) on about the error in order to restore the error (see Hayward: column 5, lines 10-19, lines 65-67, and column 6, lines 1-4).

In regards to claim 12, the modified system comprises the step of during registration and when requesting product information, information being sent when the user clicks on a 'send' button during registration or when the user selects a particular type of support information (i.e. select a product demonstration button, via menu). See Hayward column 4, lines 5-11 and column 5, lines 42-61.

In regards to claim 13, during a normal operation of a television, the TV receives and processes broadcast signal. Therefore the modified system is operative to receive and process a broadcast signal when an error condition has not occurred.

In regards to claim 14, the modified system comprises a support menu from the manufacturer's site provide function information menu (such as guided tours, demonstration on product) as well as error check up menu. See Hayward column 5, lines 10-19 and lines 31-57.

In regards to claim 15, the modified system comprises the step of diagnosing an error, and receiving measures on about the error in order to restore the error automatically when the error restoring information exists (see Hayward: column 5, lines 10-19, lines 65-67, and column 6, lines 1-4, where the error is restored by showing the user how to replace an ink cartridge). Hayward further teaches that it is well known to give a wide variety of error conditions upon occurrence of an error condition. See column 1, lines 63-67 and column 2, lines 1-7.

In regards to claim 18, the modified system comprises the step of displaying a list of functions corresponding to the product (i.e. menu allowing users to make various selections on product related service). See Hayward column 5, lines 35-57.

In regards to claim 20, the modified system comprises the step of when the system contacts during an error condition, the user is directed to a specific “peripheral condition” site indicated by the peripheral indicia (that directs it to the appropriate product). See column Hayward 5, lines 56-47. However, if no peripheral condition occurs, the system does not comprise a peripheral condition or product indicia to report and therefore when the user accesses the manufacturer’s site, will be directed to a manufacturer’s general site.

In regards to claims 21, see claim 1.

In regards to claim 31, Hayward discloses the step of receiving a signal requesting information about a computer peripheral device (i.e. user clicks “show me” button, see column 6, lines 21-24); transmitting a model name or a model number (peripheral indicia, see column 3, line 66-column 4, line 2) of the peripheral

from the peripheral to a particular website based on the received signal (based on requested info regarding peripheral condition), the particular site and model number (internet site launched based on peripheral indicia and condition, see column 6, lines 30-41); receiving service menu from the particular website (see column 6, lines 47-57 and figure 4); and displaying the received menu information on the display (see figure 4).

Hayward only discloses that the product comprises a computer peripheral and does not disclose a television in communication with the computer system.

Examiner takes official notice that TV card was a well-known computer peripheral device at the time of the invention that can be added to a computer, thereby allowing the computer to act like a television by providing broadcast programs.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by adding a TV card peripheral device to the computer of Hayward, thereby enabling TV functionalities at the computer.

In regards to claim 32, Hayward discloses that the user clicking a "show me" button requests the received signal. Hayward is silent about the type of user interface device used to make the selection.

Examiner takes official notice that a user interface device can be used to make selections on the computer/TV system, the user interface device therefore being a television "remote control".

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize a user interface device in order to make selections.

In regards to claim 33, Hayward discloses the step of selecting information from the received service menu information (see figure 4, and column 7, lines 48-65.

In regards to claim 34, the modified system comprises the step of receiving the selected information from the service menu information, and displaying the selected information on the television. See Hayward: column 7, lines 48-51.

In regards to claim 36, the receiving of service menu information includes receiving an error check up menu from the particular web site. See Hayward: column 5, lines 10-19 and lines 31-57.

5. Claims 2, 16, 22-30, 32, 37-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayward et al. (US. Pat. 6,629,134) in view of Platt et al. (US Pat. 6,757,837).

In regards to claims 2, 37 and 38, Hayward discloses diagnosing an error, and showing the user how to restore an error. Hayward is silent about automatically restoring an error of the product based on received information.

Platt discloses the step of automatically restoring an software failure/error of a product based on a received information. See abstract, column 4, lines 2-8.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to further modify the system in view of Platt's teachings of automatically restoring software failures through a server, thereby restoring a system to proper functionality after diagnosing the error.

In regards to claim 16, the modified system does not teach the step of adding a error information to a list of errors when it does not exist in the list.

Platt discloses the step of logging all the errors, including new errors in order to learn the history of failures at a machine, analyze the error to provide the needed repairs. See Platt: abstract, column 4, lines 8-13, column 10, lines 37-41.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system in view of Platt, by logging errors to obtain a history of failures at the client device, as well as analyze new errors to provide the needed repairs.

In regards to claims 22 and 23, see claim 2.

In regards to claim 24, the modified system does not comprise the step of transmitting information regarding an error to the certain site.

Platt discloses the step of transmitting the error information to the certain site. See column 3, lines 54-66.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the system by allowing the client to transmit the error information in addition to the proper information, so that the server can log the information and send automatic restoration routines based on the received error.

In regards to claim 25, see claim 2.

In regards to claim 26, the received information of the modified system is based on the selection of an item in the error check up menu. See Hayward: column 6, lines 20-24, lines 30-34.

In regards to claim 27, Hayward discloses a system for providing the user of a computer peripheral function information (guided tour, interactive demonstration of peripheral operation) and error check up menu (upon occurrences of error conditions) of the product by using a proper information (peripheral indicia) and contact information (i.e. product website site) of the product. The system comprises means to automatically detect the product indicia in case of an error and establish communications with a support site, and therefore inherently stores the proper information and the contact information in order to establish communication with the product site. See abstract, column 5, lines 10-19, and lines 53-57. The controlling unit is the computer 30, that displays information corresponding to the function information (see column 5, lines 55-57) and an error check up menu of the product received from the Internet (see column 6, lines 25-48, and column 7, lines 51-61) based on the proper information of the product and the contact information.

Hayward only discloses that the product comprises a computer peripheral and does not disclose a television in communication with the computer system and is silent about the step of automatically restoring an error of the product based on received information.

Examiner takes official notice that TV card was a well-known computer peripheral device at the time of the invention that can be added to a computer, thereby allowing the computer to act like a television by providing broadcast programs.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by adding a TV card peripheral device to the computer of Hayward, thereby enabling TV functionalities at the computer.

Platt further discloses the step of automatically restoring a software failure/error of a computer device based on received information. See abstract, column 4, lines 2-8.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to further modify the system in view of Platt's teachings of automatically restoring software failures through a server, thereby restoring a system to proper functionality after diagnosing the error.

In regards to claim 28, the modified system comprises error check up menu of the product. See Hayward: column 6, lines 25-48, and column 7, lines 51-61.

In regards to claim 29, the modified system comprises a television having a display (displayed on screen of computer 30, see Hayward, figures 2-4).

In regards to claim 30, the controlling function outputs errors and controls displaying of error information requested by the user (see Hayward: column 48-51 and figures 3-4).

In regards to claim 32, Hayward discloses that the user clicking a "show me" button requests the received signal. Hayward is silent about the type of user interface device used to make the selection.

Platt discloses using a remote control to initiate a diagnostic, error checkup mode of a client device. See column 7, lines 10-13.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize a remote control to initiate the process of error check up as well as make selections to obtain additional information about a product.

6. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayward et al. (US. Pat. 6,629,134) in view of Kaneko (JP 06008594 A).

In regards to claim 17, the modified system does not disclose contacting a serviceman for repair upon the occurrence of a fatal error.

Kaneko teaches the step of contacting a serviceman for repair upon the occurrence of a fatal issue. See abstract.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the system to request a repair from a service man when a fatal error is encountered. The motivation is to request the serviceman to repair an issue that cannot be automatically resolved.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Usha Raman whose telephone number is (571) 272-7380. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri: 9am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

UR



CHRIS KELLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600